UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,073	12/23/2004	Atsushi Fukui	MAM-056	7337

20374 7590 03/20/2009

KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK
SUITE 1105
1215 SOUTH CLARK STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
LEE, CYNTHIA K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1795	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10519073	12/23/2004	FUKUI ET AL.	MAM-056

KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK
SUITE 1105
1215 SOUTH CLARK STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
CYNTHIA LEE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER**
1795	20090312

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Reply Brief mailed 12/29/2008 has been acknowledged by the Examiner. The response to the Reply Brief is as follows:

On pgs 2-3 of the Reply Brief, Applicant argues that the Examiner's statement that "The mechanical properties recited in claim 2 for the current collector are deemed to have been met by a process in which a surface roughened copper foil current collector and the binder are sintered below the decomposition temperature and above the melting temperature of the binder." is incorrect.

In response, the Examiner notes that the Applicant's argument outlined on pg 3 of the Reply Brief is flawed because the Applicant argues that the current collector b2 is heated above the "glass transition" temperature, whereas the Examiner noted that the current collector needs to be heated above the "melting" temperature.

On pg 5 of the Reply Brief, Applicant argues that the Examiner's position is not correct because it amounts to a comparison of the negative electrode of the present invention with a negative electrode suggested by the Examiner's combination of references and that does not exist in the prior art.

In response, it is the Examiner's position that the mechanical properties do exist in the combination of references because it is an inherent property.

The Examiner has fully addressed Applicant's arguments submitted in the Reply Brief. The Reply Brief has been forward to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

/PATRICK RYAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Cynthia Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795